PRP

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/560,079	04/27/2000	John E. Brezak JR.	MS139778.2	2852

27195   7590   09/23/2003

AMIN & TUROCY, LLP
24TH FLOOR, NATIONAL CITY CENTER
1900 EAST NINTH STREET
CLEVELAND, OH 44114

EXAMINER
JUNG, DAVID YIUK

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2134	5

DATE MAILED: 09/23/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 07-01)

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/560,079	Applicant(s) Brezak et al.	
	Examiner David Jung	Art Unit 2134	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE ___3___ MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136 (a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *Aug 9, 2001* _____ .

2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b) ☒ This action is non-final.

3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) ☒ Claim(s) *1-25* _____ is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above, claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) ☒ Claim(s) *1-25* _____ is/are rejected.

7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) ☐ Claims _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on ___*Apr 27, 2000*___ is/are a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.

    If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some* c) ☐ None of:

      1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____ .

      3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    *See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14) ☒ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

    a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). *4*

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) ☐ Other: _____

III.   DETAILED ACTION

Claims Presented

1.   1-25 are presented.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms

the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office

action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically
> disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the
> differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior
> art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at
> the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the
> art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be
> negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

3.   Claims 1-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Schneier (Applied Cryptography Second Edition:

protocols, algorithms, and source code in C, 1996) and Pinkert et

al. (Operating systems: concepts, policies, and mechanisms, 1989,

prentice-hall, pp. 205-207).

4.   Regarding claim 1, Schneier teaches "wherein the search

results for the search match results for the key words are ... in

which a search match for a first number of the one or more search

engines is displayed ... (page 567, especially how Kerberos uses tickets)"

5.   These passages of Schneier do not teach "aliases"

6.   Pinkert teaches "aliases (page 205, such as at last paragraph which explicitly mentions aliases)" for the motivation of "allowing users to reference the same physical file by different logical names." As can be noted from Pinkert, aliases are sometimes used as alternate names for a single access (such as by a single entity or a single user). This is the type of alias use that in the claimed invention.

7.   It would have been obvious to those of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the claimed invention to combine the teachings of Schneier with the teachings of Pinkert for the motivation noted in the previous paragraphs so as to teach the claimed invention.

8.   Regarding claim 2, Schneier teaches such "method of claim 1 wherein the first party is a domain controller (page 567, i.e. Kerberos, which handles such domain controller situations)."

9.   Regarding claim 3, such "the method of claim 2 wherein the domain controller includes a directory service and a Global Catalog Service" are well known in the art for the motivation of connecting computers on networks (such as local area networks).

10. Regarding claim 4, such Schneier teaches "the method of claim 1 wherein the authentication of the service is provided via Kerberos (page 567, i.e. Kerberos)"

11. Regarding claim 5, such "the method of claim 1 wherein the aliases are Service Principal Names" are well known in the art for the motivation of easily implementing (because such SPN's are easily availiable).

12. Regarding claim 6, such "the method of claim 5 wherein the Service Principal Names further comprise at least one of a Service Type, an Instance Name, a Port Number, a Service Name and a Domain" are well known in the art for the motivation of easily implementing (because such types of names are easily availiable).

13. Regaarding claim 7, such "the method of claim 5 wherein the Service Principal Names are associated with an account related to a server are well known in the art for the motivation of easily implementing (because such types of names are easily availiable, such as from the server).

14. Regarding claim 8, such "the method of claim 7 wherein the step of searching a list of aliases further comprises the steps of: searching the account for an associated Service Principal name; and providing name cannonicalization by returning a ticket related to the account" are well known in the art for

the motivation of efficient handling of names in security

situations.

15.   Regarding claim 9, Schneier teaches "a domain controller for

facilitating a client authenticating a server,

comprising (page 566, i.e. Kerberos model):

     a system for providing a plurality of ... which the client

may employ to authenticate to the server (page 567, i.e.

Kerberos).

16.   These passages of Schneier do not teach "aliases."

17.   Pinkert teaches "aliases (page 205, such as at last

paragraph which explicitly mentions aliases)" for the motivation

of "allowing users to reference the same physical file by

different logical names." As can be noted from Pinkert, aliases

are sometimes used as alternate names for a single access (such

as by a single entity or a single user). This is the type of

alias use that in the claimed invention.

18.   It would have been obvious to those of ordinary skill in the

art at the time of the claimed invention to combine the teachings

of Schneier with the teachings of Pinkert for the motivation

noted in the previous paragraphs so as to teach the claimed

invention.

19. Regarding claim 10, Scheiner teaches a system for
facilitating a client authenticating a server, comprising: a
domain controller operatively coupled to the client and server;
the domain controller providing a plurality of ... which permit
the client to authenticate the server via at least one of the ...
(pages 567, i.e. Kerberos).

20. These passages of Schneier do not teach "aliases."

21. Pinkert teaches "aliases (page 205, such as at last
paragraph which explicitly mentions aliases)" for the motivation
of "allowing users to reference the same physical file by
different logical names." As can be noted from Pinkert, aliases
are sometimes used as alternate names for a single access (such
as by a single entity or a single user). This is the type of
alias use that in the claimed invention.

22. It would have been obvious to those of ordinary skill in the
art at the time of the claimed invention to combine the teachings
of Schneier with the teachings of Pinkert for the motivation
noted in the previous paragraphs so as to teach the claimed
invention.

23. Regarding claim 11, Schneier teaches a system for
facilitating authentication of a service, comprising:

means for receiving a request for authentication of the service from a client, the request including a first ... (page 566, Kerberos Model);

means for searching a list of ... associated with the service (page 567, Kerberos);

means for enabling the client to access the service if a match is found between the first ... and at least one ... of the list of ... (page 567, Kerberos).

24. These passages of Schneier do not teach "aliases"

25. Pinkert teaches "aliases (page 205, such as at last paragraph which explicitly mentions aliases)" for the motivation of "allowing users to reference the same physical file by different logical names." As can be noted from Pinkert, aliases are sometimes used as alternate names for a single access (such as by a single entity or a single user). This is the type of alias use that in the claimed invention.

26. It would have been obvious to those of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the claimed invention to combine the teachings of Schneier with the teachings of Pinkert for the motivation noted in the previous paragraphs so as to teach the claimed invention.

27. Regarding claim 12 (the system of claim 11 including a means for generating an implicit list facilitating automatic creation of Service Principal Names), claim 13 (the system of claim 12 further including a means for constraint checking in order to prevent authentication to an unauthorized server), claim 14 (the system of claim 13 wherein the means for constraint checking includes a Host Name and an attribute), claim 15 (the system of claim 14 wherein the means for constraint checking includes having a means for determining if a server is authentic by matching the Host Name with the attribute), these features are taught by the prior art for the reasons noted in the rejections of claims 1-10 (Schneier teaching such security features, Pinkert teaching such alias handling, the prior art as a whole teaching other features for the motivations noted in the rejections of claims 1-10).

28. Regarding claim 16, Schneier teaches a system for facilitating authentication of a service, comprising:

a domain controller for receiving a request for authentication of the service from a client, the request including a first ...(page 567, Kerberos);

wherein the domain controller searches a list of ... in an account associated with the service (page 567, Kerberos);

wherein the domain controller enables the client to access

the service via a ticket if a match is found in the account

between the first ... and at least one ... of the list of ...

(page 567, Kerberos)..

29.   These passages of Schneier do not teach "aliases"

30.   Pinkert teaches "aliases (page 205, such as at last

paragraph which explicitly mentions aliases)" for the motivation

of "allowing users to reference the same physical file by

different logical names." As can be noted from Pinkert, aliases

are sometimes used as alternate names for a single access (such

as by a single entity or a single user). This is the type of

alias use that in the claimed invention.

31.   It would have been obvious to those of ordinary skill in the

art at the time of the claimed invention to combine the teachings

of Schneier with the teachings of Pinkert for the motivation

noted in the previous paragraphs so as to teach the claimed

invention.

32.   Regarding claim 17 (the system of claim 16 wherein the

aliases are Service Principal Names), claim 18 (the system of

claim 17 wherein the Service Principal Names further comprise at

least one of a Service Type, an Instance Name, a Port Number, a

Service Name and a Domain), claim 19 (the system of claim 16

further including an implicit list to facilitate automatic

creation of Service Principal Names), claim 20 (the system of

claim 19 further including constraint checking in order to

prevent authentication to an unauthorized server), claim 21 (the

system of claim 20 wherein the constraint checking includes a

Host Name and an attribute), claim 22 (the system of claim 21

wherein the constraint checking includes determining if a server

is authentic by matching the Host Name with the attribute), these

features are taught by the prior art for the reasons noted in the

rejections of claims 1-15 (Schneier teaching such security

features, Pinkert teaching such alias handling, the prior art as

a whole teaching other features for the motivations noted in the

rejections of claims 1-15).

33. Regarding claim 23 (the system of claim 16 further including

a referral service for directing the client to another domain),

claim 24 (the system of claim 23 wherein the domain the client is

directed to may refer the client to another domain), claim 25

(the system of claim 16 wherein improved security is provided for

replicated services by including the name of the replicated

service within a Service Principal Name), these features are

taught by the prior art for the reasons noted in the rejections

of claims 1-22 (Schneier teaching such security features, Pinkert

teaching such alias handling, the prior art as a whole teaching

other features for the motivations noted in the rejections of

claims 1-22).

Conclusion

Points of Contact

34.   **Any response to this action should be mailed to:**

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Washington, D.C. 20231

or faxed to:

(703) 746-7239, (for formal communications

intended for entry)

Or:

(703) 746-5606 (for informal or draft

communications, please label "PROPOSED" or

"DRAFT")

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II,

2121 Crystal Drive, Arlington. VA., Sixth Floor (Receptionist).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier

communications from the examiner should be directed to David Jung

whose telephone number is (703) 308-5262 or Greg Morse whose

telephone number is (703) 305-4789.

David Jung

Patent Examiner

September 15, 2003